

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/046,955	MORRISON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeanine A. Goldberg	1634	

All Participants:

(1) Jeanine A. Goldberg.

(2) Susan Siegel.

Status of Application: After response

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 20 October 2005

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

ALL

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Claim 24 was discussed and applicant indicate the minor change was acceptable. Claims 30-31 were clarified to the examiner in that while SEQ ID NO: 49, 50 or 51 are used as probes the probes must selectively hybridize to SEQ ID NO: 6 or 7 respectively, thus providing the particular strain of Fusarium detected. Claims 47, 49 did not appear to have any unexpected results and would not be currently allowable. Applicant indicated they wished to cancel the claims at this time without prejudice. .